

REMARKS

This amendment is offered in response to the Office Action of July 5, 2006. Upon entry of this amendment, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above referenced application. Claims 7-23 remain in the application.

Claim Rejections

Claims 7-9, 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibecas et al. US 2004/0203342 (*Sibecas*) and further in view of Suganthan et al. US 6,791,506 (*Suganthan*) and Fuh US 6,463,474 (*Fuh*). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Sibecas teaches a communication device used as a terminal that is capable of functioning as a router for communication between other portable devices in the system (*see* Abstract).

In contradistinction, claim 13, for example, includes:

to function as a client, allowing a user to access the internet, to a first *wireless network access point* and to function as a second *wireless network access point* to one or more other client(s), including performing one or more functions chosen from the group consisting of: beacon, client connection table maintenance, client authentication, and dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) service

Applicant respectfully asserts, that a router (or repeater) is not a wireless network access point that includes performing one or more functions chosen from the group consisting of: beacon, client connection table maintenance, client authentication, and dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) service. A repeater merely repeats signals received so as to

extend the range of the original signal. As such, *Sibecas* does not disclose or suggest a wireless client that functions as a wireless access point as recited by claim 13.

Fuh generally relates to a method and apparatus for network access control. *Fuh* teaches a network device to intercept network traffic initiated from a client and directed toward a network resource, and to locally authenticate the client so as to reduce network traffic to the authentication server (see Abstract). As such *Fuh* does not disclose or suggest a wireless client that functions as a wireless access point as recited by claim 13.

Applicant notes the *Suganthan* is not cited as curing, and does not in fact cure, the deficiencies of *Sibecas* and *Fuh* as previously discussed. Therefore, since neither *Sibecas* nor *Fuh* nor *Suganthan* teach the element of a wireless client that functions as a wireless access point as recited by claim 13, no combination of *Sibecas* and *Fuh* and *Suganthan* can render obvious this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 103(a) rejections of claim 13 be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that claims 7-9 and 19 include elements similar to claim 13 and the arguments presented previously with respect to claim 13 apply to claims 7-9 and 19 as well. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 103(a) rejection of claims 7-9 and 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sibecas*, *Suganthan*, *Fuh* and further in view of *Lelsie*. In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant notes that *Lelsie* is not cited as curing, and does not in fact cure, the deficiencies of *Sibecas* and *Fuh* and *Suganthan* as previously discussed. Therefore, since neither *Sibecas* nor *Fuh* nor *Suganthan* nor *Lelsie* teach the element of a wireless client that functions as

a wireless access point as recited by these claims, no combination of *Sibecas* and *Fuh* and *Suganthan* and *Lelsie* can render obvious these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 103(a) rejections of claims 10-12 and 14-18 be withdrawn.

Claims 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sibecas*, *Suganthan*, *Fuh* and further in view of *Stanforth*. In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant notes that *Stanforth* is not cited as curing, and does not in fact cure, the deficiencies of *Sibecas* and *Fuh* and *Suganthan* as previously discussed. Therefore, since neither *Sibecas* nor *Fuh* nor *Suganthan* nor *Stanforth* teach the element of a wireless client that functions as a wireless access point as recited by these claims, no combination of *Sibecas* and *Fuh* and *Suganthan* and *Stanforth* can render obvious these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 103(a) rejections of claims 20-23 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7-23 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
Satyendra Yadav

Date: 10/5/06

by: /David L. Guglielmi Reg. No. 55,229/
David L. Guglielmi
Reg. No. 55,229
Agent for Applicant

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200